

MINUTES OF THE CITY COUNCIL

CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS

Recessed Meeting

September 20, 1954
2:00 P. M.

Council Chamber, City Hall

The meeting was called to order with Mayor McAden presiding.

Roll Call:

Present: Councilmen Long, Pearson, Thompson, White, Mayor McAden
Absent: None

Present also: W. E. Seaholm, City Manager; W. T. Williams, Jr., City Attorney; C. G. Levander, Director of Public Works; J. D. Huffman, Jr., Director of Finance.

Councilman White offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

(RESOLUTION)

WHEREAS, by the adoption of Minute No. 36570, dated August 24, 1954, the Texas State Highway Commission has proposed to the City of Austin and the County of Travis that a Highway Route be designated across and near the south side of the City of Austin, the route to be of the following general description:

BEGINNING on U. S. Highway 290 at some point west of the City Limit of Austin and thence to a connection with State Highway 71 and U. S. Highway 183 near their intersection, a distance of approximately 7.7 miles:

and,

WHEREAS, the terms and conditions of such proposal are satisfactory to the City of Austin; Now, Therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN:

That such proposal and all of its terms and conditions be, and the same are hereby approved and accepted by the City of Austin.

The motion, seconded by Councilman Long, carried by the following vote:
Ayes: Councilmen Long, Pearson, Thompson, White, Mayor McAden
Noes: None

In this connection, Councilman Pearson asked the Council to consider setting up about \$20,000 to take options on this property, and assign someone to

start working on getting these options right away within the next 60 days, as the property can be purchased now, while in the future it will cost so much more.

The Council continued its study of the budget. Councilman Thompson submitted his proposal for paving, showing that under city's participation of 40% it cost \$782 to get ready for paving and \$880 to actually pave, which made \$1662 per block that the taxpayers paid in comparison to \$1320 the property owners paid. He suggested reducing the city's participation to 10%, meaning the city would pay \$220 for the paving plus the \$782, totaling \$1002 per block against the property owners paying \$1980. The property owners would pay $\frac{2}{3}$ and the city $\frac{1}{3}$. If the City would cut its participation to 10% and appropriate \$200,000, 200 blocks could be paved, knocking off \$10,000 street maintenance for next year's budget. Even if it took 30 years to get the 6000 blocks paved, it would be worth it. He looked with favor upon voting a bond issue; and if it could be sold at $2\frac{1}{2}\%$, the city reduced its participating 10%, give the property owners part of the savings, charge them 4%, which would be a savings of 1%, the City could get the paving down for cash and give the people paving for approximately what they are now paying and reduce the general taxpayers. Councilman Pearson thought something should be placed in the budget each year for some type of paving, and cut down on the \$316,000 for maintenance.

Further discussion covered the cost of maintenance of equipment. The City Manager stated for the one and a half million dollars, the average replacement would be about seven years. That would take \$200,000 a year to replace. Very little has been spent on replacement, although quite a bit had been spend on repairs. Councilman Thompson asked the Council to think about the proposition of letting the equipment run down to the point it was costing excessive repairs along with the question of voting shorter hours for employees, when there was not enough money to keep the equipment replaced. Councilmen White and Long believed that the Administration would report its urgent needs on replacement.

Councilman Long inquired about the Incinerator. The City Manager stated it would cost \$125,000 for repairs. As the City grew, it would still need an incinerator but possibly not the kind that we had now. Cost for new construction was \$2,000 per ton. To replace the incinerator would be \$300,000.

Discussion was held on reducing Property Additions in the Utility Fund from what had been an average over the past five years of $1\frac{1}{2}$ million dollars to \$978,135. The City Manager explained the transfer of funds from the Utility Department, Page 166 of the Budget in this respect. Councilman Thompson asked if the Council should maintain the utility system out of current funds and set up reserves or should it transfer that money and build the plant out of bond money.

Councilman White inquired about the \$175,000 for building an addition to the City Hall. The City Manager stated there was a dire need to get more room on the ground floor for the utility department, and he was recommending expanding into the Court. Discussion followed pertaining to the use of the basement for additional space and renting out the back lot for a parking lot for additional revenue. No action was taken on the \$175,000 for expanding the City Hall for utility purposes.

Councilman Pearson again suggested before any action was taken on the budget to leave \$20 or \$30,000 unallocated to take care of the right-of-way

needed by the Highway route in South Austin.

Councilman Long moved to take the recommendation out of the Budget concerning the once-a-week garbage pick-up. The motion, seconded by Councilman Pearson, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Long, Pearson, Thompson, White, Mayor McAden
Noes: None

The Mayor brought up the ordinance ordering an election for submitting to the people the ordinance contained in a petition by the firemen. Councilman Pearson was anxious to have the policy be that no certain hours would be set up; that the Chief could set out the hours as was necessary. Councilman Thompson stated the firemen had agreed to withdraw that petition and the whole deal and accept the shorter hours and no other deals. He wanted to let the people have an opportunity to vote on it. After more discussion, the Council decided to take no action at this time, but to vote on it September 22nd.

There being no further business, the Council adjourned at 4:40 P. M., subject to the call of the Mayor.

APPROVED:



Mayor

ATTEST:



City Clerk